

Tribhuvan University

Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad's *Tughlaq*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English,

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Master's Degree of Arts in English

By

Gopal Khadka

Roll No. 476/066/67

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

April 2017

Tribhuvan University  
Central Department of English  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu  
Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Gopal Khadka has completed his thesis entitled “Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad’s *Tughlaq*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from 5<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2016 A.D. to 7<sup>th</sup> April 2017 A.D. I hereby recommend his thesis to be submitted for viva-voce.

\_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Jiva Nath Lamsal

**Supervisor**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Tribhuvan University  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Science  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Approval

This thesis submitted to Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Gopal Khadka entitled “Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad’s *Tughlaq*” has been approved by undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Central Department of English

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## Acknowledgements

First of all, I'd like to express my gratitude and owe a debt to my respected research supervisor, Mr. Jiva Nath Lamsal, lecturer at the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University (CDE, TU) for his patient guidance and invaluable suggestions at every step of my work. This work would not have been materialized in this form without his intellectual direction.

Similarly, my sincere gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head of CDE, TU and all the respected teachers and administrative staffs of CDE, T.U. for their continual support and inspiration.

Likewise, I am heavily indebted to my parents, Dhundi Raj Khadka and Chandra Kala Khadka for their entire support from financial management to the management of household works.

My brother, Manoj Khadka, deserves my warmest thanks for his unfailing support, advice, encouragement and entire financial investment, who brought me in such an academic level during the development of this project.

I am also thankful to Mr. Sanjay Khadka and Chhatra Bahadur Niroula for typing my thesis and editing the technical mistakes.

Finally, I must also thank my friends, colleagues, and family members who have directly or indirectly provided impetus I needed to undertake my research work. The role of my family in my life is seminal. My love and thanks, therefore, go as always to Kul Keshar Basnet, Ritu Thapa, Santosh Majhi and Bhusan Pradhan.

Gopal Khadka  
April, 2017

## Abstract

The fluctuating political conflicts between Sultan Tughlaq and his courtiers have been depicted one after the other in Girish Karnad's play *Tughlaq*. There is obviously, murder, intrigue, killing and suffering but they all are creative. The intensity of Sultan's power changes with variation in political circumstances. The determinant factors such as power and intellectuality, cultural values and norms, economy and social practices impact on the balance of power. The power is not in hierarchy, but in horizontal relationship that the research finds. Besides, this thesis finds that both politics and religion are ideological constructs based on false assumption of conspiracy and rebel. After analyzing the play through the theoretical perspective of New Historicism, this research entitled "Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad's *Tughlaq*" comes to the conclusion that Karnad dramatizes the psychological trauma of Sultan and internal conflict within Royal Palace between the two ideologies i.e. religion and politics where there is challenge to sustain ancestral power to rule. Moreover, Karnad draws on 14<sup>th</sup> century pre-independence India in order to criticize and draw the parallel line in the post – colonial period.

## Contents

Topic	page
Acknowledgements	
Letter of Recommendation	
Letter of Approval	
Abstract	
I.    Socio-Political Issues in Girish Karnad's Play <i>Tughlaq</i> : An Introduction	
II.   Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad's <i>Tughlaq</i> : Textual Analysis	
III.  Karnad's <i>Tughlaq</i> as a Political Commentary on Post-Colonial India: A Conclusion	
Works Cited	

## **I. Socio-political issues in Girish Karnad's Plays: An Introduction**

This research entitled "Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad's *Tughlaq*" probes into the issues of how Girish Karnad draws on socio-political and historical context of fourteenth century India in order to unravel the political disillusionment in the postcolonial period of India with reference to Girish Karnad's play *Tughlaq*. Moreover, this research particularly brings into discussion the historical context of ancient Indian Tughlaq dynasty by focusing on the characters such as Tughlaq, Barani, Aziz and Azam. The play *Tughlaq* dramatizes the story of Sultan Muhammad Bin Tughlaq, Sultan of Delhi of fourteenth century India. It draws the contours of contemporary reality upon the historical canvas. The play subverts the boundaries created by traditional thoughts on power and marginal voices. Drawing the plots of his plays from Indian history, myths and legends, Girish Karnad presents them in such a way that they assume contemporary significance. So, the play raises a series of questions in my mind: Why does such a kind hearted and merciful king, Tughlaq turn in contradiction to his own ideas? The protagonist suffers from the striking gap between political aspirations and its reality. Karnad brings the historical conditions that surround Tughlaq, himself. Is the character "Tughlaq" a tragic hero? In the play, Karnad has shown so many obstacles faced by the marginalized and suppressed people. Therefore, the issues of class, power, economics and women also come as a passing reference in this research.

The main contention of the researcher is that Tughlaq subverts the dual character of religion and power, caste schedule, women miseries and males' excesses and economic policy and lack of its proper implementation. Specifically, there are two types of ideologies which have been foregrounded by the playwright. The ideologies are political and religious. And, here the religious ideology has been suppressed by the political ideology. In other words, this research

decentralizes the characters: the king Tughlaq, Aziz, Kafir (man), women's roles in socio-political condition in one way or other way.

In order to justify the claim of the researcher, this research mobilizes the theoretical insights of New Historicism, particularly the ideas of Stephen Greenblatt, Louis Montrose and Michel Foucault. New Historicists argue that we cannot separate any literary text from their historical context. For them all interpretation is subjectively filtered through one's own set of historically conditioned viewpoints. History is an intersection of discourses that establishes an episteme, a dominant ideology. The real center of inquiry is not the text, but history. As a post-modern perspective, New-Historicism denies the hierarchy and the vertical history. So, I have selected the New-Historical reading as the best perspective to historicize and contextualize the text with contemporary Indian society and to have my research and write a thesis paper. This thesis, "Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Girish Karnad's *Tughlaq*" shows the tussle of two sorts of ideologies i.e. political and religious and marginal voices. It has subverted the medieval ideological constructions and historical context with reference to postcolonial context of India by bringing fore, the buried voice of political power and voiceless of the people. The ideology of that would show the dominance of religious power disregarding other and decentralization of marginalized voices.

Greenblatt writes that "the New Historicism in its own methodological assumptions is less concerned with treating literary works as models of organic unity than as fields of force, places of dissension and shifting interests, occasions for the jostling of orthodox and subversive impulses." (Habib, 763). New Historicism also challenges the hierarchical distinction between "literary foreground" and "political background", as well as between artistic and other kinds of production. It acknowledges that when we speak of "culture", we are speaking of a "complex



network of institutions, practices, and beliefs”. Michel Foucault opines in his well-celebrated essay “Truth and power” that the truth as a product of discourse is changeable. He argues that power is not merely physical force but pervasive human dynamic determining our relationships to others. Similarly, Louis Montrose is of the opinion that Since the late 1970s, “New Historicists” have worked on “a refiguring of the socio-cultural field within which canonical Renaissance literary and dramatic works were originally produced”. They resituate these works “not only in relationship to other genres and modes of discourse but also in relationship to contemporaneous social institutions and non-discursive practices” (17). Their theoretical insights are applicable to look into the historicity in Girish Karnad’s play *Tughlaq*.

Girish Karnad, born in Matheran, Maharashtra in a Saraswat Brahmin Konkani family, was a son of Rao Sahib Dr. Karnad and Krishna Bai Mankeekara. Krishna Bai, a widow was serving as a homemaker for Rao Sahib and his disabled wife for about five years. He had his initial school in Marathi. His parents were interested in Natak Mandalis which facilitates Girish for travelling theatre groups in Sirsi Karnataka. During childhood, he was a keen fan of *Yakshagana* and theater in his village. Now, he resides in Bangalore, Karnataka. His adopted language is Kannada.

He got his Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics and statistics from Karnataka Arts College, Dharwad (Karnataka), in the year 1958. After graduation, he went to study Philosophy, Politics and Economics at Magdalen in Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar (1960–63) England and, got his Master of Arts degree in philosophy, political science and economics. Karnad was also elected as an Oxford Union’s president in 1963.

Karnad has been composing plays for about five decades relating contemporary issues with history, folklores, legends and mythology. He received acclaim for his plays written in Kannada, which are translated into English and Indian languages and directed by directors like Ebrahim Alkazi, B. V. Karanth, Alyque Padamsee, Prasanna, Arvind Gaur, Satyadev Dubey, Vijaya Mehta, Shyamanand Jalan, Amal Allana and Zafer Mohiuddin. His activity in the Indian cinema, especially in Hindi and Kannada cinema as an actor, director, and screenwriter provided him with awards like Padma Shri, Padma Bhushan and four Filmfare Awards. He resigned from the Oxford University Press, Chennai after working for seven years (1963–70) for writing full-time. During his stay in Madras he was involved with local amateur theatre group known as “The Madras Players”. He works as a visiting professor at the University of Chicago and Fulbright playwright-in-residence during 1987–88. He served as a director of the Nehru Centre and appointed as Minister of Culture, in the Indian High Commission, London (2000–2003). He worked as the chairman of the Sangeet Natak Akademi, the National Academy of the Performing Arts (1988–93). With the beginning of his play writing career, there was high influence by renaissance in western literature in Kannada literature. Writers would choose a topic that looks entirely alien to indicator of native soil. C. Rajagopalachari’s version of the Mahabharata was published in 1951, left a deep impact on him.

*Yayati*, his first play was a self-consciously existentialist play on the theme of responsibility. A new approach of drawing historical and mythological resources to challenge modern themes and existentialist problems of modern man through characters locked in psychological and philosophical fights. *Tughlaq* (1964), was his second play which is about a hastily idealist 14th-century Sultan of Delhi, Muhammad bin Tughlaq, and symbol on the Nehruvian era which started with ambitious idealism and ended up in disillusionment.

*Hayavadana* (1971) was developed from a theme drawn from *The Transposed Heads*, a 1940 novel by Thomas Mann, which is originally found in the 11th-century Sanskrit text of Kathasarisagara. Here he uses the traditional theatre form of Yakshagana. *Naga-Mandala* (1988) was based on a folk tale related to Karnad by A. K. Ramanujam. The theatre afterward commissioned him to write the play, *Agni Mattu Male* (The Fire and the Rain). However, before it came Taledanda (Death by Beheading, 1990) which used the backdrop, the rise of Veerashaivism, a fundamental protest and reform movement in 12th century Karnataka to bring out current issues. But, my concern is only with *Tughlaq*.

The modern era has witnessed a lot of socio – political upheavals in all spheres. It is an age full of complexities, complications, baffling and revolutionary ideas. The age in which we dwell is loaded with tensions and dark issues of life. It provides just materialistic satisfaction at the cost of spiritual relief. Hunger for money, lust and fame have made man insane and he finds himself all alone on the dark shore of incompleteness with no glimpse of life-giving water, suffocated and trapped in his own desires struggling with the question – “To be or not to be”.

The scientific researches and globalization have damaged our moral and cultural values to a great extent and we are on the verge of ‘Gone’. Lusts, women’s emancipation, liberation, craving for money and existentialism have been the topics of preference of modern writers, but Karnad excels here by having the framework of history and mythology he brushes up the dilemma of an individual in the modern context. In this way, he sustains our history and culture in literature and makes his readers aware of India’s grand history and culture. Very artistically he conveys the feeling of contemporary tensions by going back and digging into the past.

Karnad has a realistic approach to life in all his plays. His characters are not mere flesh and blood individuals but broad representatives of their class and ideology. With a plot, he also

adds some sub – plots that provide play tic relief in his plays without digressing from the main issue of the story. The techniques and styles of his plays are apt; the language is highly political and imaginative, communicating the idealism of his characters. The use of symbols, idioms and phrases add to the atmosphere of mystery and suspense. His plays also successfully follow the three unities making his plays a complete one. His plays basically deal with the problems of isolation, frustration, despair, skepticism, jealousy, craving for money and fame, search for identity and other modern issues like condition of women in a male dominated world and caste differences.

Thus, it can be said that his plays rest on the heaps of dead past but talk of modernity. About the choice of mythology based issues, Karnad says that he doesn't know how to write a story and he draws from the repository of mythology, folklore and history. It is such a rich source material that some of the origin for the stories in the western world could be traced to India. Besides they have contemporary relevance. They infuse life into play. The purpose of the proposed study is to highlight this very use of history and ancient mythology as parables of modern experiences.

During 2012, TATA Lit Fest, in Mumbai, where Karnad gave a speech on "his life in theater" in an hour-long session. In place of talking about the subject, he expressed on off-topic of V. S. Naipaul for his "antagonism towards Indian Muslims". V. S. Naipaul had previously been awarded by the Lifetime Achievement Award by the festival's organizers. Karnad also criticized the organizers for honoring Naipaul. Someone among organizer, Anil Dhadwaker, tried weakly to diverge the speech to more politically. Others were tickled by the episode, and some mentioned on the research and logic that had gone into the speech (unfortunately outshined by its “scandalous” nature). After few weeks of this event, Karnad again formed controversy by

appealing that Rabindranath Tagore was a second-rate playwright and that his plays were "intolerable". During November 2015, while marking birth celebrations of 18<sup>th</sup> century Muslim ruler-Tipu Sultan. Karnad said that Bangalore International Airport should be named after Tipu Sultan in place of Kempe Gowda. The right-wing groups uproar on Karnad's statement. Afterwards Karnad apologized. Karnad is an advocate of multi-culturalism and freedom of expression. Girish Karnad has been an opponent of religious fundamentalism and Hindutva. He openly condemned the destruction of Babri Masjid in 1992. Later, he spoke against the attempts to create controversy about the Idgah Maidan in Hubli. He is an advocate of secularism and has opposed Rastriya Swayamsewak Sangh, Bharatiya Janta Party and other Hindu organizations on several occasions. He has opposed Narendra Modi for the Prime Minister's post in the 2014 parliament elections.

In the area of play writing, he comprises the secularism as a key point where a Hindu deity or a Muslim legendary hero, was alienated from his real religious or cultural tie-ups; and myths and legends, emptied of meaning, were reshaped into tightly constructed *Melo* plays with thundering curtain lines and a searing climax. He is following the Parsi theatre regarding the Western bourgeois notions of secularism, egalitarianism and individual merit, at home it remained committed to the traditional loyalties of caste, family, religion and colonial culture.

While we draw on history books of India, we find that British colonialism ended in 1947 AD and thus, India got independence. The reunion of 565 princely states under the union of India results in the formation of complex society. Previous boundary and territory of princely merges or breaks forming new administrative units. Indians also began to migrate interstate especially from rural areas to urban areas. This migration caused rapid change in demographic factors. The

postcolonial society consist of various conflicts in between various religious, ethnic, lingual, regional groups, etc. The major conflict is based on lingual as most of the states are formed on this purpose. Problems such as economic issues, overpopulation, poverty, environmental pollution, religious, politic and ethnic conflicts ruin Indian society.

Similarly, political history of India shows that India was ruled by religious minority for a long while. The Independence movement was regarded by Hindus as an opportunity to regain legacy of Hindu majority land while Muslim dreamed to regain political power back from British which was taken from Muslims (Mughal). Conflict between Hindu and Muslim reached its apex developing rebellious environment resulting in partition of India. As India was former British colony all the economic resources were handled by British East India Company as income. British East India Company Government had highly invested in transportation systems. Economic resources were bankrupted. So just after independence, India wasn't economically strong which ultimately relates to financial scarcity of Indians Government. Poverty highly influences social structure and bond. India was grooming in different cultures at the same time. It is boosting liberal Hinduism with continuous social reforms while Muslims with Muslim personal law board correspondingly exercises extreme gender discriminations. The society was male dominated. There is a huge gender discrimination prevailing in society. The right of woman and children doesn't get an approach in ground. The Indian people are nationalists and one can notice this nationalism in their religious belief. Various social evils prevail in society such as childhood marriage, polygamy, witchcraft and untouchability. Certain portion of people were treated as untouchables which leads to various social conflicts. Indian Administration tried to address these people under different sectorslike Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribe. However, Indian started being in touch with educations. It is known that religion and language shape

culture and form the vision of the nation i.e. colonist became successful in implanting English as one of the official languages and Christianity has become a noticeable religion. Education facility was satisfactory as compared to other countries at that time.

Hindus from Bangladesh and Pakistan were forced to leave for India and thousands were rudely slaughtered. They suffered from various inhuman activities. Muslims too suffered from this brutality in some places. Hindus from Pakistan and Bangladesh entered India for safety. After division, India becomes a secular state providing homage to people of all religious views while East Pakistan (Bangladesh) and Pakistan declare themselves as an Islamic state. Later Hindu-Muslim began to forget the wounds of sorrow and started living together with harmony relation in India. In another word, they practiced religious tolerance and social solidarity. Thus, India became a state with unity in diversity.

Tughlaq's reign is parallel to postcolonial Indian politics. Karnad has taken the context to depict his contemporary scenarios of politics via the play *Tughlaq*. *Tughlaq* is a play of the sixties, and mirrors the political attitude of disillusionment which followed the idealism of Nehru era in the country. Karnad himself has stated on this:

What struck me absolutely about Tughlaq's history was that it was contemporary. The fact that here was the most idealistic, the most intelligent king ever to come on the throne of Delhi ... and one of the greatest failures also. And within a span of twenty years this tremendously capable man had gone to pieces. This seemed to be both due to his idealism as well as the shortcomings within him, such as his impatience, his cruelty, his feeling that he had the only correct answer. And I felt in the early sixties India had also come very far in the same direction – the twenty – year period seemed to me very much a striking parallel. (144)

He compares between the past and present scenarios of Indian politics. The play raises issues of economy, culture, social and power. He takes Tughlaq's character as a protagonist who possesses a complex and confusing ideology. Karnad has dramatized Tughlaq's compound personality aspects. Critics have made complete analyses of the play through dramatic features, focusing on the symbolism of the game of chess, the theme of disguise, the ironic success of Aziz whose wonderful story runs parallel to Tughlaq's dualism and the hero within Tughlaq. The source of entire tragedy is the basis of the dualism between distinct characters within Tughlaq.

Regarding the *Tughlaq* play, Sultan is a visionary ruler but tragically failed he says. He further comments:

My subject was the life of Muhammad Tughlaq, a fourteenth century sultan of Delhi, certainly the most brilliant individual ever to ascend the throne of Delhi and also one of the biggest failures. After a reign distinguished for policies that today seem far – sighted to the point of genius, but which in their day earned him the title 'Muhammad the Mad', the sultan ended his career in bloodshed and political chaos. In a sense, the play reflected the slow disillusionment my generation felt with the new politics of independent India: the gradual erosion of the ethical norms that guided the movement for independence, and the coming to terms with cynicism and realpolitik. (7)

Here, Tughlaq tries to balance the gap between the rulers and the ruled, the mysterious games of power politics and areas of public interest in the play. Karnad portrays the present political scenarios with reference to the historical context. As the historical political characters suffer political backfire even with the best policy and will. Similarly, present political leadership overcomes the same scenario.



In this context, DD Kosambi says:

Under Nehru's leadership, the government attempted to develop India quickly by embarking on agrarian reform and rapid industrialization. A successful land reform was introduced that abolished giant landholdings, but efforts to redistribute land by placing limits on landownership failed. Attempts to introduce large-scale cooperative farming were frustrated by landowning rural elites. It is not only the case of land rather its connectivity to the large amount of population which has its own cultural and social significance, which means, obviously, the entire politics became worthless. This is, merely the failure of Nehru's leadership. (249-250)

Under Nehru's leadership, he made a plan to develop India quickly on agrarian reform and rapid industrialization in terms of economy. Landowning rural elites who formed the core of the powerful right-wing of the Congress supported in opposing the efforts of Nehru. And, the land reform project failed to redistribute land by placing limits on landownership and to introduce large-scale cooperative farming. At the same time, a series of famines would cause serious food shortages despite the steady progress and increase in agricultural production. Further, Amiya Kumar Bagchi illustrates the failure in terms of economy and administrative policy of Tughlaq and Nehru as follows:

[...] the then, had the play idea of introducing for the first time in India the concept of token currency, using brass and copper coin rather than silver. Very few people exchanged their gold/silver coins for the new copper ones. The new currency was also easy to forge so there were heavy losses due to this. After the plan failed there were heaps of copper coins lying around the Royal offices for

years which is the main cause of his failure but while talking about Nehru's failure he failed by his own policy such as planning commission for national plans, railways, international trade policy and the concept to nationalize the oil industries, tea plantation and land reforms. Though these policies are expected to make great economy but in reality, he failed for the first time in independent India. (100-101)

Under Tughlaq's reign, relief measures provided by him were stolen by corrupt officers. People suffered from hunger, famine and other humiliations for long. The counterfeit coins of copper flooded in the market. A growing scarcity of silver led to the brain trend because all people tried to store gold and silver coins and stopped the rotation of it. Trade almost came to a standstill. He conducted an experimental cultivation in 60 Sq. miles in area nearly, but productive outcome does not come and it was stopped.

Regarding Girish Karnad's political scenarios, he is hopeless due to ill-practice of politics and fail in policy implementation, it results downfall of post-colonial Indian era. M. Visveswaraya says about Nehru's failure as follows:

Nehru was a great figure in world politics from India but there are some issues where he fails to make them proper for his future policy in India. As long as colonial hang over concern Nehru knew the entire environment and his politically calculation of the situation is right but his policy of being close to Muslims and advocacy for their rights affects the entire Indian politics and there becomes a trend to use Muslims as a vote bank at the time of elections. However, it is Nehru's success theoretically in politics but due to the Indian psychology hanged

in the late colonial phase does not accept it [...] where the system misleads and blames Nehru for his religious propaganda. (37)

As Tughlaq was in favor of Hindu, but Nehru was in favor of Muslim being biased in justice to fulfill their interests such as getting support, vote, liberty and so-called integrity. It was their religious propaganda to hold power. The former ruler practiced in the 14<sup>th</sup> century and the latter in the postcolonial period.

U. R. Ananthamurthy, a renowned Kannada playwright and critic, remarks:

Karnad is the poet of play. The use of history and mythology to tackle contemporary themes gives him the psychological distance to comment on our times. Tughlaq worked so well because it was not a realistic play however it is the history of the nation which is similar to the age of Nehru and his political career. Both Nehru and Tughlaq have the brilliant individual character but in politics both are failure which is Karnad's attempt to make the theme of the play. (117)

Although both Tughlaq and Karnad are visionary, but they are diverted from reality because they are idealists and are guided by heart, not by mind. They just around in their daydream of an ideal state, but could not form a *RAMRAJYA*. It is a subject of a talk and a guff because they are failures in political career.

Another critic, Rajunder Paul, opines about Karnad's Tughlaq in these words:

The most idealistic, the most intelligent king over to come (to) the throne of Delhi including the Mughal who nevertheless, ended as one of the greatest failure because of contradictions in his personality and the self-defining nature of his politics. The 20 years' period of Tughlaq's decline as a ruler also offered striking parallels to the two decades of Indian independence under Nehru's idealistic but

troubled leadership and Nehru appeared remarkably like Tughlaq in his propensity for failure despite an extraordinary intellect. (12)

Rajunder Paul has different views on Tughlaq in comparison to other critics that both Tughlaq and Nehru were failures because of their different interpersonal quality, overconfidence and lack of farsightedness. They were political failures to address their contemporary social, political, cultural and economic issues.

Dharwadkar observes *Tughlaq* as follows:

Karnad revives the paradoxical Tughlaq of history and occasionally constructs his ideologue verbatim out of various historical documents especially Barani's contemporaneous account of Tughlaq's reign, the *Tarikh-i-Firoj Shahi*. He also follows the chronology of Tughlaq's reign closely, mixes historical characters (such as Barani, Najib, Sheikh Imam and Aziz), and thus creates a complex ideological and intertextual connection between history, historiography and his fiction. The effect of such interlineations, moreover, is not to perpetuate but to problematize the received history of Tughlaq: the play urges contemporary Indian audiences to scrutinize the premodern and colonial institutions that have created their understanding of the past, and to question institutionalized history a source of knowledge. (xx)

Here, Dharwadkar looks at the play *Tughlaq* that Girish Karnad is an artistic writer who has taken Tughlaq as a complex character to compare to Nehru. The characters like Barani (historian), Najib (politician), Sheikh Imam-Ud-Din (Pacifist priest), Aziz (Muslim Dhobi) occur constantly from Tughlaq's father's reign to Tughlaq's reign. Although history is totally not fact, but his contemporary scenarios help to see, analyse and evaluate the histories of 14<sup>th</sup> era because

the history is the combination of fact and fiction. The history is written by power. This thought just turns upside down to other thoughts. He suggests that we have to take the present references to look the history. *Tughlaq* is the chronological history account of the reign of Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq. And assume that the protagonist, Tughlaq is the most visionary and farsighted ruler in Indian history. So, he insists on the modern institution to see past what they take the past is the product of post – colonial period.

Similarly, Shubha Nigam highlights the contemporary issues in her interpretation of the play. She writes:

Tughlaq was based on the life of the emperor Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq. An accomplished scholar, effective orator and a violent monarch, Tughlaq was obsessed with the idea of controlling his subjects with an iron hand and to think of himself as a representative of God. His decision to shift the capital from one city to another was not poor in itself; but the implementation of it was carried out very poorly. Instead of shifting his administrative offices, he ordered the people to leave their homes and reach the new city within a short span. So, autocratic was Tughlaq that he did not even hesitate to resort to violence on those subjects who delayed the shifting to the new city. In modern perspective, Tughlaq is Karnad's take on current political scenario in India. He indirectly suggests through this play that religion proves detrimental to the progress of a nation. Power and people intoxicated by power are hardly interested in what way the nation is going in, with their primary aim being to fully enjoy the allotted powers. (11)

Here, Nigam traces the problem between religion and politics. She shows that religious doctrines in power politics bring a disaster in the progress of a nation. Girish Karnad is also worried about

the religious leaders in politics in Post-colonial period. He sees communal violence and ethnic cleansing in his circumstances as an eyewitness. So, he suggests to separate these two ideologies for the purpose of holding power through the help of the play *Tughlaq* because it hinders in the prosperity of a nation. Otherwise, it gives birth to an autocratic ruler with the background of religion.

H.N. Vishwakarma broadly analyses the play *Tughlaq* via the perspectives of dramatic elements and minute issues of societies and further says:

In *Tughlaq* Karnad has drawn a parallel between the historical realities of fourteenth century Delhi Sultanate and twentieth century India. It was deliberately written in the convention of the company of Natak. All the scenes are divided and alternated between deep scenes and shallow scenes. The shallow scenes are usually played in the foreground of the stage with a painted curtain depicting a street as a backdrop. These scenes are reserved for lower class characters and kept for comedy. They served as link scenes in the development of the plot, but the main purpose was to keep the audience engaged while the deep scenes, which showed interiors of palaces, royal parks, and other such visually opulent sets, were being changed or decorated. The major characters rarely appeared in the street scenes, and in the deep scenes the lower classes strictly kept their place. Characters of the play are clearly divided into those which came into shallow scenes and those which came into deep scene. (4)

Here, Girish Karnad has portrayed all the Indian societies in the play what he has experienced in his life. The society has the intricate relations among high class, mid class and lower class in terms of social status.

Karnad is interested in showing the real scenarios of his contemporary society regarding power relation, economic condition, cultural aspects and religious conflicts. He tries to redraw the boundary of conventional aspect via the means of literary creation i.e. the play *Tughlaq* with reference to 14<sup>th</sup> era Indian history correlating to post-colonial period. In this regard, Chaman Singh writes:

Karnad's another play *Tughlaq* is also regarded as a contemporary play about a contemporary situation. It is called a minor classic of dramatic literature.

Tughlaq's reign like king Solomon began in glory but ended in near failure.

Solomon failed for the heavy taxes which he had to impose upon the tribes in order to raise money for the magnificent temple which his father: David, had long dreamed to build in Jerusalem. This made him unpopular. Tughlaq's changing of capital and currency became his hallmarks and which caused him considerable trouble. He miserably failed even to weld his people into a real nation, a powerful country and a united people. His dream was shattered. Even before his death one could see the shadow of coming events that would wreck the good that his ancestors had done. The country began crumbling around the edges with the loss of certain satellite kingdoms, but for more serious were the forces at work within which would soon rip the country asunder. Man turns to God for help in times of troubles, discouragement and sorrow. (6)

Here, Chaman Singh is different from other critics because he compares Tughlaq's reign to Solomon's reign. He analyses the veteran and powerful rulers' reign as a means of economic policy and monetary system of it. They were both failures in the historical period pathetically, though visionary.

Many researches have been conducted on Karnad's play *Tughlaq* from different perspectives such as post-colonial study, cultural and historicism. But the Karnad's play has not been analyzed from the perspective of New historicism. So, this research aims to fill that critical gap.

This research work has been divided into three chapters. The first chapter mainly provides an introductory outline of the study. It incorporates the explanation of the hypothesis in terms of socio-political representation of *Tughlaq* with relevance to the Indian postcolonial era. It also provides a detailed introduction to the playwright and his works. The second chapter is the analysis of Karnad's play from the perspective of New Historicism. It gives a short introduction to the comparison between two ages in terms of socio-political issues such as power, culture, economic, violence, women miseries and Dalit's concern. Regarding this part, it will be the critical approach to the study of text. And finally, the third chapter concludes the thesis by specifically mentioning its findings.



## II. Projection of Post-Independence Political Disillusionment in Karnad's *Tughlaq*

By using the legendary and historical chapters to highlight complications, which challenges the modern India at several levels, Karnad's play *Tughlaq*, published three years later has taken a part from the Muslim era of Indian history, artistically draws striking parallels, between India then and India now. *Tughlaq* is a surviving input to modern Indian English play. It has strangely become successful on the stage due to its appeal to viewers and its dramatic excellence. The life and turbulent reign of Muhammad-bin Tughlaq who ruled over India for about twenty-six years from (1324 – 1351) is brought into discussion in this play. This play spans only five years from 1327-1332 for dramatic accuracy and conciseness. The play begins in Delhi in the year 1327 AD, then on the way to Daulatabad from Delhi and finally in and around the fort of Daulatabad. So, it is pertinent to look after some historical details of his reign in order to understand the play.

Fifth Sultanate of Delhi was the house of Tughlaq. Ghazi Malik Tughlaq (1320 - 1325) was the founder of Tughlaq dynasty. With regard to own excellence, he got the designation of Governor of the Punjab below Ala-ud-din Khilji. The last emperor of the Khiljis was succeeded by the slave, Khusru Khan, who is regarded as immoral and faithless slave. Ghazi Malik Tughlaq and his son, Malik Jauna, gathered a party of Turkish chief, defeated Khusru Khan. The noble offered the crown to him and started his reign in 1320 popularly with the title Ghiyas-ud-din. The special qualities of a General and far-sighted statesman were found in him. Peace and order in the empire was retained by him. Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq, his son ascended to the throne after his death along with his second son in an accident. Muhammad-Bin-Tughlaq was an ambitious sultan and he elaborated new policies or innovations in case of foreign as well as domestic affairs. His foreign affairs stimulate him with a dream to conquer not only the entire Indian subcontinent but also Characin outside its border. His domestic policy, he brought innovations in

different arenas of administration, which, though struggled with best aims, affected badly the prosperities of his kingdom.

Revenue administration was one of the earliest measures of concern of Muhammad Tughlaq. He began a practice of recording income and expenditure of all the provinces with an objective to maintain uniform standard of land revenue all over his domain. Nothing came out of this arrangement and it was abandoned later. Muhammad Tughlaq setup a distinct division of agriculture and appointed a minister to look after it. He tried state farming under the care of this division and a huge area of land, nearly 60 Sq. miles in area. Experimental cultivation was done on this area of land for three years and then, when productive outcome doesn't come, it was stopped. However, the most thoughtful arrangements of reorganizations of Muhammad-Bin-Tughlaq were tax system in the Doab, Changing the capital from Delhi to Daulatabad and beginning of the use of copper coins, which have been regarded as 'madness' of Muhammad Tughlaq.

Girish Karnad seems to be thankful to modern historians Zia-ud-Din Barani (Tarikh-I-Firuz Shahi), Ibn Bututah (Travels), Badoni (Tarikh-I-Mubarak Shahi) and Al-Marshi (The Maslikal-Absar). Karnad has been authentic to documented history. He contracted certain events in order to adjust in time span i.e. 1327-1332 just for dramatic effect. The play is chronologically set into two natural parts -ambitious scheduling at Delhi and the disaster in Daulatabad. Girish Karnad carefully tracks the old-style sources, which shows Tughlaq as combination of opposites - a visionary and a man of action, caring and punishing, sincere and godless.

The portrays of Tughlaq inside both play and history is of a great scholar, realist and

visionary. His viewpoints for administrative improvements, for executing the strategy of Hindu-Muslim friendliness, appreciation of quality, regardless of Caste and creed; reforming of administrative equipment and taxation assembly; formation of democratic society in which all shall enjoy justice, equality and ultimate human rights. A rationalist and theorist, Tughlaq fundamentally diverges from the religious views in matter of politics and administration. His distance from the holy beliefs angers the traditional persons and they judge, clash with and rebel against Tughlaq. Islamic extremist assumes Tughlaq as a non-believer in Islam as he ends the jiziya tax, treats Hindus and Muslims equally.

Tughlaq was not understood throughout his reign. His intelligent dimensions and love of attitude were believed as hostility to Islam. His friendly relations with Yogis and Jains and his involvement in the Hindu festivals were observed as his being Hinduized. His energies to interrupt the influence of Ulemas and Sufies were supposed to be anti-Islamic. His desire to start political communication with the world outside India was believed as madness. He was regarded as a dictator by the old political leadership. Ulemas declared that war against Tughlaq was legal. A principled, humanist and visionary Tughlaq was a sharp politician who is guilty of parricide and fratricide. He was charged of father murder at prayer time. Girish Karnad, a great and gifted playwright, uses plea as a leitmotiv in Tughlaq, which has not been so much linkage in history. It generates a bright melodramatic outcome.

The play *Tughlaq* is itself allegorical. It is not only historical rather it is relevant to the modern times. The play was written in 1964, one year after the death of Nehru. 16 years after independence, India was still in a state of turmoil and was no better than when it had started off as an independent country. Thus, Tughlaq becomes allegorical of the dreams of Nehru. The Indian government policies are echoed by those of Tughlaq policies. The disillusionment echoed

was not only of India but of the Third world countries as well. Karnad has raised the issue of disillusionment in the play by the following dialogue:

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: I implore your majesty not to move the capital to Daulatabad. I am not from Delhi myself and have no stake in it. But I know the people of Delhi are very unhappy about the move. I have seen -

MUHAMMAD: what am I to do, Shihab-Ud-Din? I have explained every reason to them, shown how my empire cannot flourish with Delhi as its capital. But how can I explain tomorrow to those who haven't even opened their eyes to the light of today? Let's not waste more time over that. They will see the point soon. It's getting late and I must tell you the more important news. From next year, we shall have copper currency in our empire along with the silver dinars. (181-182)

New historians focus on the power configurations- especially in the aspects of class, gender, race and ethnicity – that prevails in their present culture. As Foucault generalizes his theory in terms of power through its historical context and understands cultural and intellectual history through literature which documents the new discipline of the history of ideas. On the other hand, Louis Montrose insists that the contextualization of literature involves a reexamination of an author's position within a linguistics system. He also points out that New Historicism variously recognizes the ability to challenge social and political authority.

After probing into these above views, I come to a conclusion that Karnad is a liberal democratic in politics and as a follower of Nehru opposition to BJP, he is concerned with the fame of Nehru. He compares the historical hero with his ideal hero: Nehru. For that, the above vision of Muhammad is the policy of his state for the next year. But vision fail does not solely

depend on one person because the state has different stakeholders and mechanisms such as hierarchical and horizontal power relations, culture and current political scenarios. Though his policy was failed in terms of the copper currency, he had his own vision in his state. It is also allegorical to the modern India at the time of Nehru as he was also failed in the same level. That the good -will of Nehru, Karnad wants to show. Karnad is serious in religious ideologies in politics and division of people in polar in the Indian history. As a result, the renowned figures in politics fail.

Tughlaq's reign failed because of proper policy implementation untimely. Tughlaq proposed different policies in his state to develop socio-economic, religious and other aspects of his state. Those policies proposed by Tughlaq were suitable and far-sighted but the Amirs, ministers and scholars of his state always define Tughlaq's policies negatively in spite of their help and suggestions they were always the major hindrance in terms of policy implementation. Every plan and policy of Tughlaq rule was of a great importance but higher post official, ministers and religious head always creates a discourse that those policies and plans were not suitable for the state. The above lines of Muhammad seem as an example of his brilliant mind and good emperor of his time. His policy was apt but his workmen were not good. Even the concept of the Sultan Muhammad is somewhat democratic but his religious people and other officials were rude and as a result his policy became fail.

Girish Karnad portrays the characters in the play to represent political power imposition on people seriously. Autocracy is the system of government with one person with absolute power. However most of the autocrat justifies their interest with logics. Tughlaq being the most intelligent Sultan at Delhi with absolute powers. He *ordered* all to migrate from Delhi to Daulatabad with his own logical background. Jawaharlal Nehru however was an elected leader

but presence of opposition in a negligible number behave him like a dictator. He suppresses political minority:

NAJIB: Your Majesty, if this incident is to be kept a secret, I'm afraid we'll have to hang everyone who was here – even the Hindu guards. They remained loyal to Your Majesty but they have seen it all and are bound to talk. It does mean more corpses. But then that'll only make the show more impressive.

MUHAMMAD: Najib, I want Delhi vacated immediately. Every living soul in Delhi will leave for Daulatabad within a fortnight. I was too soft. I can see that now. They'll only understand the whip. Everyone must leave. Not a light should be seen in the windows of Delhi. Not a wisp of smoke should rise from its chimneys. Nothing but an empty graveyard of Delhi will satisfy me now. (185-186)

For Nietzsche, all human conduct is ultimately inspired by the concept of will to power. On the other hand, Foucault writes in *History of Sexuality*, “Indeed” it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together” (100). Now, one can see how the power holder, the European became dominant by writing on the native from the European vantage point, and thus othering, disparaging and dehumanizing the non-western.

Girish Karnad has illustrated two models of autocracy such as will to power by Tughlaq over slave or people and majority power of Nehru over minority in modern times. Tughlaq appealed and forced his people to move from Delhi to Daulatabad voluntarily. For the three reasons. At first, he wants to safeguard his empire from invasion which is at high risk with Delhi as a capital. Secondly, he wants to extend his empire towards south and develop its capital at the

Daulatabad which will be at the center of his territory. Thirdly, he wants to make capital in the Hindu majority city in order to make Amirs weak in power. Girish Karnad has created a discourse to represent the parallel condition to Nehruvian era. Nehru only used the minority for a vote bank hypocritically. But Karnad has shown the power by intellectuality in the latter case of Nehru as Foucault says. Autocracy in liberal form is more dangerous than dictator's autocracy because people cannot realize what is going on them.

In the play, Karnad also brings under discussion the political dishonesty caused by corruption and bribery. Bribe is the dishonestly persuade to act in one's favour by a gift of money or other inducement. Government liable on public should be free from bribe. Bribe had taken a major role in our society since ages. Tughlaq and Nehru reign, both were flourished under the manure of bribe. The following dialogue represents the idea:

HINDU WOMAN: Please let me go, sir ... My child ... please have mercy on it ... only for a day, sir...

AZIZ: I told you I can't. No one can be allowed out of sight until we reach Daulatabad. I'm sorry, but I have my orders.

HINDU WOMAN: But I'll return tomorrow ... I swear by my child I will ... It's dying, Your Excellency, I have to take it to a doctor ...

AZIZ: But what can I do? There's the hakim's tent. Go to him. He'll give you some medicine. (In a low voice). I've told you what you can do. I could try and bribe my senior officials, but you'll have to pay for it. (188)

Girish Karnad raises the issue of chronic pain of corruption and bribery. He characterizes with the discourse of historical period and co-relates to his contemporary discourse when the

bribery prevails in India. As Foucault says that the New Historicism could not be restricted to these texts themselves or to their author's psychology and background; rather, pile larger contexts and culture conventions in which texts were produced need to be considered. (176) It is of peoples' ignorance. The discourse is not aware of corruption's impact in the progress and prosperity of a nation. The culture of bribery practiced from ancient time to now. Karnad wants to address the great problem of corruption in his play, especially in the political and social fields. It has been practiced in all levels. It has earned a prestigious status in the society. But Karnad wants to discourage this system and trend.

In the above dialogue, Aziz first of all wants to make someone frighten with his strictness and suggest to go to doctor. Later he indirectly starts bargaining with the name of senior officials arguing for money. We can conclude government servant like Aziz are always ready to bribe in the medieval age as well as in postcolonial.

Caste system is a strict hierarchical social system based on fundamental ideas of purity and pollution. It was widely found in medieval India. During Tughlaq it was also regarded as a matter of social status. In postcolonial India, it was densely found with correlation with certain social evils. Even, caste system leads to untouchability in certain arena. Karnad depicts the issue as follows:

MUHAMMAD: (Exploding) Hold your tongue, fool! You dare pass judgement on me? You think your tongue is so light and swift that you can trap me by your stupid clowning? Let's see how well it wags when hanging from the top of a pole. I haven't cared for the bravest and wisest of men – you think I would succumb to you, a dhobi, masquerading as a saint?



AZIZ: (Quietly) What if I am a dhobi, Your Majesty? When it comes to washing away filth, no saint is a match for a dhobi. (217-218)

The most prominent New Historicist critic Louis Montrose believes that Historicism variously recognizes the ability to challenge social and political authority. (762) history in its historicism and in its political interpretation, New Historicism is indebted to Marxism. Whereas Marxism tends to see literature as part of a 'superstructure' in which the economic base manifests itself. New Historicism thinkers tend to take a more distinct view of power, seeing it not exclusively as class-related but extending throughout the society. A dhobi is sociologically and economically inferior in the Indian society the Indian discourse has its ideology. But, Karnad is opposed to this view. The personal intellectuality determines the personal power. New Historicist argue that all levels of society share in the circulation of power through the production and distribution of the most elementary cultural and social "texts". Power does not reside somehow "above", with lawyers, politicians, and the police, but rather follows a principle of circulation, whereby everyone participants in the maintenance of existing power structures.

In the above dialogue, Tuglaq was fired on Aziz, a dhobi, on regard to this judgement with light and swift tongue trying to trap Sultan. Aziz was finally trying to gain mercy by introducing himself as a bravest and wisest man. He argued that dhobi is greater than saint in their own profession. So, Aziz shows a dhobi can be far wise than a saint i.e. capacities are not developed as per caste system. So, Sultan provided Aziz mercy with life and job in army. In postcolonial India, Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar popularly known as Baba Saheb, was an Indian jurist, economist, politician and social reformer who inspired the Dalit Buddhist Movement and campaigned against social discrimination against Untouchables (*Dalits*). He was an Independent

India's first law minister and the principal architect of the Constitution of India. We can conclude that someone suffering from caste system emerge up either by wisdom or hard working.

Colonizers' motive of defining things by centering them and discourse made by colonizers always was a major problem for the post colonized countries. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin says about post colonialism is the study of the philosophical and cultural aftermath of western colonialism, and in order to escape the inevitable bias which is the profound experience of colonialism, one has to escape their own actual history and biography, much like how a former colonial nation must come to resent it's given past and both paradoxically and ironically come up with a new national identity.

YOUNG MAN: They say it's the widest road in the world. But it looks no bigger than a thin snake from here.

OLD MAN: And four years ago that snake bit a whole city to death.

What a fort! What a magnificent thing! I met a foreign visitor the other day and he said he has been round the world and not seen fort as strong as this anyway. (192)

From the above dialogue between Old Man and Young Man, Karnad indicates the colonial representation and resistance. There is directly and indirectly resistance in culture, language, economy and politics. It results no absolute truth and purity as well as prosperity. It is very broad spectrum within which much of the play of colonialist relations and postcolonial examinations and subversion of those relations have taken place. Both conquest and colonization, texts and textuality play a major part. Colonial texts, anthropologies, history, and fictions captured the colonized subjects within colonialist framework which read his or her alterity as terror or lack. Within the compound relations of colonialism these representations were re-projected to the

colonized official education or general colonialist cultural relation. This resistance and the representation may be not appropriate as such idea, at last, which shows the harassment in the nation.

Foucault shows that social and political power work through discourse. Truth and knowledge are determined by the society in any given era. There are no 'absolute' truths, not even permanently 'authentic' truth and knowledge of history because even historical writing is entangled in cultural 'tropes' or symbols! Besides being biased due to the subjectivity of those who write it and the limitations of its creation. Discourses are produced within the real world of power and struggle and they are means to gain, maintain or subvert the existing power systems. Truth depends on who creates and maintains history, or who has the power to create and perpetuate what is taken as truth. For instance, both the colonizer and colonized create their own kinds of truth, but they create the opposite truths. So, there are no absolutely true or absolutely false discourses of any kind; there are only more powerful and less powerful ones. Powerful discourses determine and dominate the mode of thought and other discourses.

Tughlaq had thought of introducing copper coin by learning from China where China used paper note at the time. Chinese accept paper as currency because of their faith in the emperor's seal. This is the matter of trust for one's own country. Postcolonial India too used paper currency in monetary system.

AMIR 1: Whatever for? I mean what does one do with a copper coin?

MUHAMMAD: Exchange it for a silver coin! A copper coin will have the same value as a silver dinar.

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: But I don't understand, Your Majesty. How can one accept a copper coin to have the same value as a silver one?

MUHAMMAD: It's a question of confidence. A question of trust! The other day I heard that in china they have paper currency – paper, mind you – and yet it works because the people accept it. They have faith in the Emperor's seal on the pieces of paper. (182)

In above dialogue, Tughlaq wants peoples' trust and confidence in his rule as in China. The Emperor's seal creates faith with that paper as currency. Nowadays, in postcolonial India paper currency is effectively running. We can conclude that Tughlaq wants trust and faith of his people in him.

New historicists capture Materialists, interested in the questions of circulation, negotiation, profit and exchange. They support to be above the market (including literature) and informed by the value of that market. However, they take this position further by then claiming that all culture activities are considered as equally important texts for historical analysis. New Historicism is more specifically concerned with the questions of power and culture. It contains the messy comings of the social and the culture practices. It opposes the autonomous self and the cultural political institutions that produce that self. Karnad relates this idea through this dialogue that Muslim culture and Tughlaq ideology contradict to each other and people discourse is related to Muslim culture. He does not get support from people and they call him "Mad Muhammad". People were in doubt. On the other hand, Hindus were against the Muslim emperor.

Girish had created a discourse of approval of copper coin, do people accept it? For him Tughlaq wants to introduce copper coin in order to make monetary system easier. Here, Karnad wants to show and support new scheme of Sultan. But I think, Tughlaq wants to control total monetary system of his empire which reduces the chance of local rebel as silver dinar is deposited in his treasury releasing just copper coins. If new invader invades his empire, people won't cooperate with him as their monetary links are connected with Tughlaq. It will cause difficulties for governor to rebel. So, we should not only judge this event as an economic plan but keenly political move to insert roots very deep into soil as in real representation like new historical.

Girish Karnad beautifully and symbolically portrays the character: Tughlaq for the theme of political mood to show disillusionment and chaos. Through the protagonist of the play, Karnad tried to show lack of practicability and wrong time decision of Sultan Tughlaq which was a major reason of failure of Tughlaq's reign. Nehru, postcolonial head of the state, was also the victim of practicability and wrong time decisions. Their decisions go parallelly. Beside this Karnad attempts to show leadership only cannot change things for the nation's development; it was the organized efforts of the people and their previous education, thinking, knowledge and the quality to live in peaceful societies. U. R. Anantha Murthy says: "... it is a play of the sixties, and reflects as no other than play perhaps does the political mood of disillusionment which followed the Nehru era of idealism in the country." (143). To clarify the idea, I have taken the following excerpt:

STEP-MOTHER: What do I know about your chess? You'd better write to Ain-ul-Mulk about it. He'll love it!

MUHAMMAD: Funny you should mention him. I was just thinking of him – but not with reference to chess. You see, my dear friend Ain-ul-Mulk, the companion of my childhood, my fellow champion in chess, is at this very moment marching on Delhi.

STEP-MOTHER: What? What do you mean?

MUHAMMAD: Exactly what I said. He is marching on Delhi with an army of thirty thousand. (155)

The above dialogue clearly represents the symbols of disillusionment in Tughlaq. He is isolated from the rest of his kingdom and passionately involved in the game of chess. Tughlaq's step-mother reprimands him for his recklessness in matters of his own security. She rebukes him for not initiating action to counter Ain-ul-Mulk's anticipated attack on Tughlaq's kingdom. Like Foucault, the interpreters who are powerful create his/her own discourse which is either false or true. And, they want to grab it as Tughlaq is plotting his own tactics to tackle the problem by creating a trap. It is a power struggle to challenge social and political authority as a game.

Duality in the character refers to the people with two imaginations and two characters by himself or herself. Tughlaq organized a program in front of Big Mosque and started an interaction with Sheikh Imam-ud-din in front of mass. Previously, he informed all public to participate in the interaction. While, finally, he deployed his soldiers not to let anyone coming there. Karnad creates a dialogue to represent Tughlaq's dual character as follows:

SHEIKH: So you don't know what actually happened behind the scenes?

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: Behind the scenes? (More derisive laughter.)

SHEIKH: Yes, behind the scenes. It's true the Sultan invited the whole of Delhi to hear the Sheikh. Yet, on that very afternoon, soldiers went from door to door threatening dire consequences if anyone dared to attend the meeting.

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: (Slowly) Does the Sultan know this? (More laughter)

SHEIKH: They were his orders! And do you know, while the Sultan stood in front of the Great Mosque with the Sheikh and got more and more agitated at the empty auditorium, his soldiers were hiding in the streets around stopping those who tried to come? You don't believe it? Look here...

(Unbuttons his shirt and shows a wound on his shoulder.)

I tried to force my way to the Big Mosque and this is what I got for it. Who else would do this to an old man like me? (176)

In the above paragraph, Sheikh Shams-ud-din told Sahib-ud-din about the interaction program of Tughlaq and Sheikh Imam-ud-din. He also said that when he forces on his ways he was stopped by army. In postcolonial India, most of the leaders bear dual characters. We can conclude that Tughlaq has a dual character in politics of power. The implementation of New Historicism looks at the buried voice that was kingly power who ruled over religious people like Sheikh Shams - Ud-Din and Imam -Ud-Din. It subverts the notion of objectivity of history and presents the different versions of the history. Here, Karnad takes Tughlaq as a successful powerholder character in the play. He goes to maintain and balance his power by using political and religious leaders as an intrigue.

The decision of Tughlaq to introduce copper coin was to increase access people in monetary system and bring rapid reform in economy. But many fraud minded mafias take the

advantages of this scheme. They began to produce counterfeit coins. Aziz was the masters of fraud. He was one of the major counterfeit coin frauds. In postcolonial India, duplicate paper currency was made as a counterfeit. It impacts on the value of currency in India and other. I have taken the dialogue to prove it:

AZIZ: Don't call me Aziz. I've told you. As for her, I've only obeyed my orders. Besides I'm a Brahmin and she won't complain against a Brahmin to a Muslim officer. That'll send her straight to hell. In any case – and listen to this carefully – we won't stay in the Sultan's service for long. I heard some rumors in Delhi. The Sultan's going to introduce copper coins soon. And a copper coin will have the same value as a silver dinar. What do you say to that?

AAZAM: (Making a face) Eyah! There's no fun in stealing copper coins.

AZIZ: Shut up! Just listen to what I'm telling you – you are not going to pinch any coins, you are going to make them. Make counterfeit coins, you understand? If your fingers are getting restless, use them there. (Noise off-stage) Ha! There's the next lot! (190-191)

In the above Dialogue, Aziz informs Aazam about his plan regarding Tughlaq's copper coin scheme. He told Aazam to collect as more silver dinar as possible through this scheme. We, can conclude that Aziz is eager to earn with every scheme of Sultan and his mind runs before Sultan.

Montrose in his book *Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture* writes “The post-structuralist orientation to history now emerging in literary studies may be characterized . . . as a reciprocal concern with the historicity of texts and the textuality of history” (20). Counterfeit and forgery is prevailing throughout India particularly and as a problem occurs



globally at the present. Karnad is worried about the economic crisis due to forgery and inflation by the greedy and terrorists in post-colonial period.

Tughlaq being Sultan of such a vast empire has some superb ideas about the development and prosperity of his empire. His keen intelligence seems to be the pioneer roadmap for his reign. But due to his fate, time always opposes to his wisdom. Continuous failure leads him towards frustration. As the same way, Jawaharlal Nehru became the prime minister of India immediately after independence. He also had a lot of dream about India's future but became frustrate after losing confidence of majority Hindu population through Muslim appeasement. I want to prove it from the following extract:

BARANI: Your Majesty – he's dead! (Muhammad stops, then flings the dagger away in disgust.)

MUHAMMAD: (Anguished) why must this happen, Barani? Are all those I trust condemned to go down in history as traitors? What is happening? Tell me, Barani, will my reign be nothing more than a tortured scream which will stay the night and melt away in the silence?

(he is trembling all over. At a sign from Najib, the soldiers lay the body down on a mat and go away. Muhammad stare at the body.)

Najib, see that every man involved in this is caught and beheaded. Stuff their bodies with straw and hang them up in the palace-yard. Let them hang there for a week. No, send them round my kingdom. Let every one of my subjects see them. Let everyone see what ... (chokes). (185)

In the above dialogue, Tughlaq in front of Barani and Najib get frustrated as all his trusted fellows betrayed him one after another. He found himself surrounded with tortuous cry or grief on the rebel led by Shihab-ud-din. Finally, to suppress his frustration with cruelty, he ordered Najib to catch and behead all rebels like Amirs, Sheikh Shams-ud-din. He wants to show throughout his empire by his punishment to rebels.

Similarly, Jawaharlal Nehru was frustrated by the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi and rise of Hindu Mahasabha. He thought of destruction of Rastriya Swayamsewak Sangh (RSS) and Hindu Mahasabha and accused it for murder of Mahatma Gandhi. He motivates government and judicial system in sentencing Nathuram Godse and Narayan Apte being hang till death on 15<sup>th</sup> November 1949, at Ambala Jail. Thus, we can conclude these two fellows had highly frustrated mood despite of their intelligence. Girish Karnad himself is conscious of religious politics to: Why doesn't it mix with religion? Girish had focused on a discourse of Tughlaq frustration from his trustworthy, what will be audience reaction? As per Karnad, Tughlaq gets frustrated due to continuous betrayal from the one he trusts most. Here, Karnad wants to express as a merciful and emotional Sultan who desires his men's faith towards him. But I think, Tughlaq was the one who mobilizes spies over spies. His degree of thinking is such a wonderful that he manages politics microscopically. As mentioned Ratansingh is his spy who was employed to cover up Sahib-ud-din, Amirs and Shams-ud-din. As per his character he doesn't seem to be emotional. If new invader invades his empire, people won't cooperate with him as their monetary links are connected with Tughlaq. It will cause difficulties for governor to rebel. So, we should not only judge this event as an economic plan but keenly political move to insert roots very deep into soil as in real representation like new historical.

International relations are the management of relationships and dealings on behalf of one country in an international level. Any activities or results of foreign policy dealings and decisions can be considered foreign relations. International supports help even a lot in medieval age. If we had renowned friends no one will invade us. So, most of the rulers pushes them up to maintain best international relationship. Tughlaq also wants to strengthen mercy of descendants of Khalifs of Baghdad in order to show his Muslims people and his top officials that he hadn't give up his faith in Islam. In postcolonial India Nehru had maintain most of International relationship of independent India. Girish Karnad raises the issues of political affairs in terms of foreign affairs of Tughlaq's reign with reference to his contemporary political era such as:

BARANI: It's good news that a descendent of the last Khalif is visiting us, Your Majesty.

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: May I compliment His Majesty on his wisdom?

MUHAMMAD: Wisdom? What a strange word to use. Why wisdom? A visit by the descendant of the Khalif could show how faithful I am or how religious I am or even perhaps how modest. But why do you say 'wisdom'? do you think I am inviting him to placate the stupid priests?

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: I didn't mean to ...

MUHAMMAD: You know, since Sheikh Imam-ud-din died I have been asking myself just one question. I am a king. I wear the royal robes. I have honoured myself with the title of Sultan. But what gives me the right to call myself a king?

(The Amirs are baffled)

Am I a king only because I am the son of a king? Or is it because I can make the people accept my laws and the army move to my commands? Or can self-confidence alone justify it? I ask you – all of you – what would you have me do to become a real king in your eyes? (Silence). (181)

From the above dialogue, we can conclude that Tughlaq recognizes his invitation for descendants of khalifs of Baghdad in order to make calm Muslim priests and Muslim people that he had still deep faith in Islam. But, externally, he wants to show that his new capital, Daulatabad was blessed with khalifs 's descendent from Baghdad via his trip. There was a period in postcolonial India where Nehru executes same functions. So, we can conclude international relations are essential in politics. The forms of maintaining power is changing as the mobility of power created by Stephen Greenblatt. Now, power is measured how a nation or a leader can be measured by the international community in this era. So, the power matters in the approved of them. The old form of concept "might is right" is subverted into equilibrium of power and co-operation under organization and non-alignment movement.

Politics is the power game since ages. Empowerment and dethronement by conspiracies are the most repeated events of global political history. Rebels always act as a challenge to stabilize power. Similarly, Tughlaq faced several rebels and conspiracies against him. Most of the time he tackled rebels with his intelligence. He also provides harsh death punishment for rebellion in order to create fear against possible rebels. Nehru was also opposed by several leaders of his time. He also tactfully defended them. Karnad quests rebellions and terrorists as follows:

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: (suddenly violent). Get on with your killing, Muhammad. Or does your hand refuse to rise against me? Beware! You won't be able to trap me with your wiles. I am not Ain-ul-Mulk to live crushed under your kindness.

(Muhammad slowly takes out his dagger. Shihab-ud-din is getting more and more frightened. He is almost screaming now as he speaks.)

You want to solve all problems in the flash of a dagger, don't you? But you can't stop this uprising now. My father distrusts you and I've already written to him, about everything here ... everything...

NAJIB: Sorry, but Ratansingh has sent those letters to us.

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: (Screaming) where will you hide my corpse? How will you gag my voice? Kill me – but you won't stop this -this will go on – (184)

The above dialogue between Shihab-ud-din and Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq as the rebel against sultan by Shihab-ud-din, Amirs and Sheikh Shams-ud-din failed. Shihab also called himself distinct from Ain-ul-mulk and doesn't lay on knee for mercy. He wants to challenge Muhammad that this rebel won't finish. Nehru also suppresses his opponents in politics. Hindu Mahasabha and Rastriya Swayamsewak Sangh are his major rivals because of his Muslim appeasement policy. From above, we can conclude that in every case of politics there may be rebel against the throne and power as Foucault suggested.

Planning and intelligence plays a major role in political management. Prompt decision taken by intelligent political mind can change adverse situation into beautiful opportunity. We can also say that the political crisis management of Tughlaq was wonderful. He can do anything to save his crown and throne. He sacrifices Sheikh Imam-ud-din for getting victory on a lost war.

Shihab's murder can create an adverse condition in relations which was immediately managed by Sultan. Such practices of sultan keep truth far away from historical pages. Hence, Karnad trusts in Nehru for the India's prosperity so that he wants to praise the farsightedness of Nehru by taking the following dialogue:

NAJIB: We must do something about Shihab-ud-din's father. He is a powerful man and he won't like this.

MUHAMMAD: (Regaining control of himself). Don't worry about him. Make a public announcement that there was a rebellion in the palace and that the nobles of the court tried to assassinate the Sultan during prayer. Say that the Sultan was saved by Shihab-ud-din who died a martyr's death defending him. The funeral will be held in Delhi and will be a grand affair. Invite his father to it and see that he is treated with the respect due to the father of a loyal nobleman.

NAJIB: Your Majesty, if this incident is to be kept a secret, I'm afraid we'll have to hang everyone who was here -even the Hindu guards. They remained loyal to your Majesty but they have seen it all and are bound to talk. It does mean more corpses. But then that'll only make the show more impressive. (185)

This dialogue between Tughlaq and Nazib expresses superb political mind of Tughlaq. He diverted an adverse relationship between Shihab-ud-din's father with him into stronger bond. Najib further adds sultan for cleansing traces of accidents by destroying proofs. In postcolonial India, Nehru doesn't bear this capacity because he could not resist Indo-Pak partition. While subverting it Nehru failed during partition.

India was mostly divided as Hindu and Muslim from Medieval age. Muslims address non-Muslims as a kafir which means a non-believer of Allah i.e. generally Hindu. This division prevails till today.

AZIZ: Leave the corpses alone in future. What did you do in Delhi, sinner that you are?

MAN: I am a kafir, Your Excellency. I have to guard the dead bodies in the palace yard – those executed by the Sultan, you know. I have to guard them for a week, ten at a time, sir, and then carry them to the canal outside the city. There again I have to guard them against thieves.

AAZAM: Thieves? Ugh!

MAN: Isn't it terrible, Your Excellency? But there it is. That's what men have come to. The relatives of the dead have to pay us a fine before taking the bodies. Well, if the orders had been obeyed I would have built a house by now. But no, they won't pay – even for the dead! They come at night and steal them. Not just the poor. Even the rich folk – the most respectable people of Delhi! I could tell you a name or two and you wouldn't believe it. It is terrible. People won't stop at anything once they get into the habit of thieving, that's certain. (189)

From the above dialogue, we can easily understand that the speaker is Hindu and works as a dead body guard and collects penalty from dead one's relatives for treasury. He finally concludes that people won't stop at anything once they get into habits of thieving.

Religion is used by the people to gain power by the aid of the follower of that particular religion whereas politics are utilized by people to acquire power at a particular land or from the supporter of particular political ideology. But the direct power practice prevails only in politics. So, religious people began to interfere in politics and develop a powerful role within it. It is the common features of Islamic State. But when the Sultan himself turns into secular they got mad. Tughlaq's governance for people of all religions made him unpopular against Muslim extremist. In postcolonial India, Nehru too supported secularism. The subverted part of Nehru's secularism was Muslim appeasement which starts making Hindus uncomfortable within their own land.

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: Sheikh Shams – ud – din? Sir, what is a holy man like you doing in this company?

SHEIKH: Yes, you are right. I should shut myself up in a mosque and devote myself to Allah. I shouldn't get mixed up in the treacherous games of politicians. I know and I had hoped my life would be like that. But Allah isn't only for me, Shihab-ud-din; He's for everyone who believes in him. While tyranny crushes the faithful into dust, how can I continue to hide in my hole? Haven't you heard what's happening to the leaders of Islam today? Sheikh Haidari is in prison. Sheikh Hood in exile...

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: I know. But they dabbled in politics.

SHEIKH: Is it so reprehensible to worry about people? Is it a crime to speak out for oneself and one's family? What politics did Sheikh Imam-ud-din indulge in? That he was open, frank and honest?

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: I don't know enough about that. But, to me it seems clear that if the Sultan is to be blamed for that death, so are all the citizens of Delhi. I sometimes feel the Sheikh must have almost wished for death after what happened in Delhi.

AMIR 1: What did happen in Delhi?

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: You know that better than me! He came here to speak to the people and not a soul turned up to hear him. Not one of you had the courage to come to the meeting ... and now you have the cheek to blame the Sultan for his death. (175)

Sheikh Shams-ud-din also wants to increase his influence in politics through religious doors. He wants to justify Tughlaq's murder plan to Shihab-ud-din. Shihab-ud-din defends Sultan. So, we can conclude from above paragraphs that Sheikh Shams-ud-din is interested in murder of Tughlaq to increase political power and Islamic extremism. Whereas Nehru Muslim appeasement was just to create vote bank for congress.



Secularism is a belief system that rejects religion or religious beliefs should not be part of the affairs of the state. Religious tolerance is the phenomenon of people with different religions living together in harmony following one's own religions without criticizing other religion.

Tughlaq was a Muslim but had to appease Hindu because majority of Indian population follow Hinduism. He cannot rule land for a long while unless he gets supports from Hindus so he began to facilizing Hindus too. In postcolonial India, Nehru followed this concept starring appeasement of Muslim. This leads as a political propaganda and established Muslims as vote bank of a particular political party. India is suffering from religious politics and violence that Karnad addresses the issue by the following dialogue:

MUHAMMAD: They tried to indulged in politics - I couldn't allow that. I have never denied the word of god, Sheikh sahib, because it's my bread and drink. I need it most when the surrounding void pushes itself into my soul and starts putting out every light burning there. But I am alone in my life. My Kingdom has millions -Muslims, Hindus, Jains. Yes, there is dirt and sickness in my kingdom. But why should I call on God to clean the dirt deposited by man?

IMAM-UD-DIN: Because only the Voice of God, the Holy Word, can do it. Please listen to me, Your Majesty. The Arabs spread Islam round the world and they struggled and fought for it for seven hundred years. They are tired now, limp and exhausted. But their work must continue and we need someone to take the lead. You could do it. You are one of the most powerful kings on earth today and you could spread the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. God has given you everything – power, learning, intelligence, talent. Now you must repay His debt.

MUHAMMAD: No one can go far on his knees. I have a long way to go. I can't afford to crawl – I have to gallop.

IMAM-UD-DIN: And you will do it without the Koran to guide you? Beware, Sultan, you are trying to become another God. It's a sin worse than Parricide.

MUHAMMAD: (Refusing the bait) Only an atheist can try to be God. I am God's most humble slave.(164)

In the above dialogue, Muhammad Tughlaq explains about his religious policy to the Sheikh Imam-ud-din. He wants to convince Sheikh that he isn't Anti-Islamic. His throne is regarded as bread and drink for him. He also stated that dirt deposited by him and his people should be cleaned by themselves, not by God. Nehru also found his premiership as his bread and drink for which he requires votes. So, we can find secular characters in both Tughlaq and Nehru.

Habib in his book *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory* writes that the "culture" in which New Historicism situated literary texts was itself regarded as a textual construct (761).It refused to accord any kind of unity or homogeneity to history or culture, viewing both as harboring networks of contradictory, competing, and unreconciled forces and interests. Karnad is in favour of secularism where state or politics and religion should be separated. Only there is healthy competition of power. He objects on his contemporary political ill-practices mixing up religion. He wants to subvert the medieval political ideologies in post-colonial period.

Superstitions are widely held but irrational belief in supernatural influences, especially as leading to good or bad luck, or a practice based on such a belief. Medieval India was full of such beliefs. People believe that most of the disease are cause of witch and can be cured by just witch-doctors. Then there prevail various other superstitions which ultimately badly affects people's

psychology. Tughlaq's time was mostly affected while Nehru's time was also not free of it. Karnad looks the pathetic condition of health and educational situation via the following dialogue in *Tughlaq*:

AAZAM: Poor thing! Why don't you let her go? The doctor may help her.

AZIZ: Have you seen the child? No witch-doctor can save it now. My niece had that illness and went out like a light. It's a waste of good money and she's going to need every paisa of it. I'm doing her a favour! And watch out for paise, Aazam; they're going to cost a lot soon.

Three more families! They must be walking on their knees. (Looks up and stares at the man). So you've come at last, have you? Perhaps you went to visit your in-laws on the way. Don't you know the orders? You were supposed to be here well before sunset. (188-189)

As Nietzsche questioned the reality, here the extract also tries to question the reality. Though the text depicts the society, but here is the question on reality. Does it look logical and believe in a witch-doctor? Are there witches? The people have their own discourse on witch and witch-doctor and rely on it. Foucault suggests that powerful persons themselves create their own ideology and impose it on people whether it is right or wrong. There is the emergence of discourse.

Tughlaq and Nehru both are wise, aware and work for social reforms. They couldn't socially reform their society eradicating superstitious beliefs. From the above dialogue, we can conclude that superstitious beliefs deepen its root during Tughlaq's reign. Superstition in India usually attributed to a lack of education. But, in India educated people have also been observed following beliefs that may be considered superstitious. Some of these beliefs and practices are

centuries old and are considered part of the tradition and religion. There are piles of documents about witch-hunting across India, but with so few witnesses prepared to testify against the killers, and traditional societies resisting efforts to wean them off the witch-doctors, they may just keep piling up. So, in contemporary time there is deep-rooted superstition in Indian society. Although Aziz is very clever, but the social institution makes him blind of superstition, Aziz's discourses thinking as powerful and the depiction of the superstition and sexual exploitation of the society also relate the text with New Historical reading.

Tax is a financial charge or levy imposed upon a taxpayer (an individual or legal entity) by a state to fund various public expenditures. A failure to pay or resistance to taxation, is usually punishable by law. Tughlaq initially collects tax as per Quran. Later he abolishes Jiziya (pilgrimage tax imposed upon Hindus) and introduces gambling tax for gamblers. He constructs school, roads, hospitals and used money for good purposes. But, he is criticized for imposing tax on drought area instead of supplying aids or compensations from state authority. In postcolonial India, there was a vast reformation in tax system.

AMIR II: Look at what's happening in Delhi. Just look at it! You can't take a step without paying some tax or another. There's even a tax on gambling. How are we to live? You can't even cheat without having to pay tax for it.

SHIHAB-UD-DIN: But he has done a lot of good work. Built schools, roads, hospitals. He has made good use of the money.

SAYYID: Then why can't he get it the right way? The Koran sanctions only four taxes, but ... (Looks at Ratansingh and stops)

RATANSINGH: (Smiles). Carry on, sir. Don't mind me. I'm here because Shihab's here; otherwise I am invisible!

SAYYID: Well ... uhm, he could tax the Hindus. The jiziya is sanctioned by the Koran. All infidels should pay it. Instead he says the infidels are our brothers...

(174)

Here, New Historicists tend to draw on the disciplines of political science and anthropology given their interest in government, institutions, and culture, while culture materialists tend to rely on economics and sociology given their interest in class, economics, and modification. (Habib 663) Karnad has seen the poor condition of administration due to lack of qualified human resources, political instability and corruption. The situation seems in both the era of Tughlaq and Nehru parallelly in administration.

Amirs don't like Tuglaq for various reasons. Tughlaq wants Amirs totally dependent on him. So, they are planning Sultan's murder. Amirs are angry as they had to pay taxes on gambling while Sayyid had gone against Sultan as he abolished Jiziya (pilgrimage tax for Hindus). They are criticizing the progressive reforms of Tughlaq. In postcolonial India, Nehru also began progressive tax reforms. So, we can conclude that both Tughlaq and Nehru had tried to reform tax system. The opposition between them is that Tughlaq doesn't forgive tax for the people affected by drought whereas Nehru started providing aids and compensation to drought affected people.

Women exploitation in India is serious because of social and political structure. There prevails superstition and ignorance in India from ancient time. Women miseries seem very depth into the society in the name of weakness, second class being, production of children and social

evils metaphorically. Karnad includes the problem of women empowerment. Why does this happen when a woman gives birth to a man and eventually exploited by him? To prove it, I have taken the following dialogue:

AZIZ: So this is your family. All eight here?

MAN: Yes, Sir.

AZIZ: Get on with you there. There's a tent kept for you. Yes! Whatever happens to the others, people like you mustn't die. The Sultan will need a lot more like you soon. So what are you going to do till the Sultan arrives in Daulatabad? Another couple of children? (181)

Girish Karnad brings into discussion the danger of people's belief in superstition leading to the suppression of women in the society as well. Women condition is poor beyond power, economic, social justice and inclusion. Girish Karnad, symbolically, does not represent Hindu woman, Stepmother and Kafir's woman as a dominant character. That is the reality where she does not react to Aziz although he dominates her by language and torture. She accepts as usual because this is a construct of patriarchal society.

### III. Karnad's *Tughlaq* as a Political Commentary on Post-Colonial India: A Conclusion

After the analysis and discussion of Girish Karnad's play, the researcher comes to the conclusion that Karnad draws on 14<sup>th</sup> century pre-Independence India in order to criticize and draw parallel line in the Post – colonial period in order to highlight the political disillusionment of the people. Besides, the research finds that literary text is heavily influenced and shaped by socio-political, economic, cultural and religious context of the time it was written.

Regarding economic perspective, the research finds that the progressive tax is very good at developing sectors which is imposed on rich people and recreational field and the tax is used for the benevolence of poor, disables and infrastructures' development. While making a plan for assassination of Sultan Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq, Shihab-ud-din replies to Amirs, Sayyid, Sheikh and Shihab-ud-din because the tax should be applied for a good work. Further, he says Tughlaq has done justice investing money on building roads, hospitals, schools, etc. Amirs were against his tax policy on gambling and more. Now, the tax system is applied world-widely. Next, Copper currency instead of money is also the best policy of monetary system of Tughlaq's reign which is also practiced in post-colonial period. But, India has developed a paper note now.

For the cultural perspective, the research comes to conclusion that literary text *Tughlaq* is influenced by the Karnad's circumstances such as religion, language, social discourse and psychology. He depicts the real scenes of culture of Hindu-Muslim conflict from history which continues till now. The ill-thought brought the partition in the territory of India. More rebels are emerging in the post-colonial India due to the feeling of majority and minority. While making Hindi as a national language, there is a great conflict in the northern side and southern side of India. They reject it up to now. Karnad also addresses the issues of culture by the scene of

Tughlaq's reign, Muslim ideology over Jain and Hindu, majority of Hindu ruled by minority of Muslim, caste system and superstition under religions. It shows a great impact on division of demography and geography. Karnad redraws the boundary and decentralizes the minority in this text based on cultural canvas.

Under social concern, the research shows that there are high class, mid class and low class under Indian societies based on caste, economy and power. It tries to reconstruct the traditional ideology and finds the solution of it that caste system is a social injustice, only economy cannot determine power and status, and power is not in hierarchy, but in horizontal. Aziz claims that a dhobi can be more talent than a saint because personal intellectuality determines power of him/her. Although Aziz is a dhobi, he disguises the role of Brahmin and Khalifa to get a social status and power, Karnad has convincingly created a scene of Justice for Dalit. Women miseries are shown by Step- mother, Hindu woman and Kafir's wife. Karnad sets up a discourse on women's role in the society that Aziz thinks women are for a machine of bearing children. They have not any roles in the society. Karnad traces the minute aspects of society and deconstructs the ideologies of caste and women.

Apropos the politics and power, the research concludes that it depicts the tussle of two ideologies viz. the political and religious one. Here is a great game of power gain and loss. But, there is neither defeat of religion nor politics. It quests to the religious politics. Karnad centralizes power in politics beyond religious and ethnic ideology. Tughlaq excludes the norms and values of particular religion and tries to make a secular country. He has a serious debate against religious leaders, people and policy. Instead, he uses Sheikh Imam-ud-din and Khalifa to dominate power and gets success. Karnad always goes against religion in politics and his political ideology is the same. He composes literary texts based on secularism. He tries to draw



the idea of political purity in place of political pollution of religion because he has experienced many disasters of a nation's partition, communal violence and riots. But, he respects any religion on the other hand. He gives value to all religions in equal and advocates a secular state.

Hence, New Historicism is a powerful means to a surgery of social problems to decentralize the prevailing marginal and suppressed voices. It seeks multiple realities because of subjective study. It is assumed that the same text refers to different things in different time and place. It quests to the past ideologies and social discourse of a particular society and community. Its stakeholders are bibliography and biography; author, text in historicity and historicity in text. It redraws the boundary of those ideology and brings the innovative ideas which are of social justice. That's why I choose it. Here, I went through the study of politics vs religion, caste schedule, women miseries, superstitious belief, economical system, cultural behavior and social injustice minutely. I hope that this research is very fruitful for revisiting the preoccupied knowledge and brings changes in thought, evaluation, behavior, and practice for a beautiful world.

## Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: TLARC, 1992.
- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory since Plato*. New York HBJCP, 1992.
- Ananthamurthy, U.R. *Critical Note on Indian Drama*. Delhi: Routledge, 1998.
- Ashcroft, B. Griffiths, and Tiffin. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Bagchi, Amiya Kumar. *Ancient Economy of India*: Motilal Banarashidash, 1983.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "From Development to Globalization." *Postcolonial Studies and Globalization Theory*. Ed. Neil Lazarus. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . -. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Dharwadker, Aparna. "Historical Fictions and Postcolonial Representation: Reading Girish Karnad's Tughlaq." *Modern Language Association*, (Jan., 1995): 43-58.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." *Critical Theories since Plato*. ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Order of Discourse." *Untying the Text: A Lost Structuralist Reader*. Ed. Robert Young and Kegan Paul. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Greenblatt, Stephen J. Introduction. *The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance*. Spec. issue of *Genre* 15.1-2 (1982): 3-6.
- Habib, M. A. R. *A History of Literary Criticism: From Plato to the Present*. London: Atlantic Publishers & Distributer, Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Karnad, Girish. *Three Plays: Nagamandala, Hayavadana and Tughlaq*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Kosambi, D.D. "Ideals Images and lives." *Postcolonial India: Emancipation and Equality*. Ed. Alice Thorner and Maithreye Krishna Raj. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2000.
- Louis, Tyson. *Critical Theory Today*, New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2006.
- Majumdar, R.C. *Indian History: A Postcolonial Reading*. Mumbai: Orient Longman, 2003.
- Montrose, Louis A. "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. 2<sup>nd</sup> Rev. ed. Blackwell, 2004.
- Montrose, Louis. "New Historicism." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992: 392-418.
- Nigam, Shubha. "Thematic Evolution in Indian English Drama in the Post-Independence Era." *Research Scholar*, 4.1(February 2016): 301-315.
- Paul, Rajundar. "The Main Rulers of India". *Ancient Politics and India*. Ed. Ramgopal Tapendra Prasad. Gorakhpur: Vani Prakashan, 1998.
- Saha, Amit Shankar. *A study of Postcolonial Literature in India*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bangalore: Saras Salil Publication, 1991.
- Said, Edward. "Arabs, Islam and the Dogmas of the West". *New York Times Book Review* 67.1 (31 October 1976): 79-81.
- - - . *Orientalism*. London: Routledge, 1978.
- Vishwakarma, H.N. "Ecclecticism in the Plays of Girish Karnad." *International Journal of Research (IJR)*, (July 2015): 584-590.
- Visveswaraya, M. *Nehru and His Politics in India: A Glimpse*. Delhi: Routledge, 1979.
- - - . *History of Sexuality*. Vol. I. Trans. Robert Hurley. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.